

man? : before no

Later in NATO? 11

United: Klein: Britain's new "deterrent"
Turkey? (since Iraq, USSR) [of who?]

finger Schaffer 5-5-05

Gunning (Def Min, today's House speaker)
Will ask US to remove nukes:

(I 605, NRDC)

480 weapons

(targets: Iran, Russia,
Syria)

(Next: 8 USAF bases in 6 countries:

Gunning; Belgium, Italy, Netherlands, Turkey

UK (Blair)

(Berlin

["No attack on Iran

or NK

or Syria

(1946; 1980 (RAND there)
we want control Iran / OTE

no "counter-prolif

ware, aggression

Next, Russia too nukes

(Many ships: US?

Russia

others?

NFU

Conventions: India, China? (Pak?)

+ NNWS

NW FZ in Europe

No "bargain" with US on disarmament

No progress toward this (CTB signed)

nor will there be - without

change in USG - not into environment.

Role of new energy?

Happiest day for me since

German move;

- ambition from US are policy
- Colloids spent for CEU inspiration
- US (R? China? India Japan?)
- NFO NSA's (not WHD)

not France
UK?
Israel

(China: give up here threat as Taiwan)

(What reaction do we want from to
NK test? from intramission?)

not AFCU of WMD's!

1. same PU = 200. Regard's
100 Terms: 20,000

Not deal of US — 3, at first, joined
(not invited, to
disrupt, delay...)

Do ^{some} others really want disarmament?

Is it must set together apart from US.

(like New Zealand: vs. US
(we!) bases)

5-5-05

Fred Kaplan:

The first draft of Axis of
Evil named only Iraq and North
Korea: David From wanted 3,
for rhetorical purposes!

It wasn't
that NK was
added as
non-Muslim.

Adding Iran infuriated Iranians,
closed a real existing prospect of
 rapprochement

Clinton ended negotiations with NK!
Bush had already rejected Clinton
framework (which Powell had endorsed)
~~though~~ (an early slap at Powell)

Though Clinton was approaching
a missile test ban - he chose instead
to negotiate in ME in final months).

Schell: China turned to its Bomb
(a ~~the~~ US design, given by Fuchs to
SU and by SU to China;
turned up in Kiboga, in 'Chinese'
(China to Pak?)

China turned to Bomb after SU but then
down ~~to~~ in Quincy II, 1958
(US "success" → China Bomb!)

like: Israel + France get ones together,
when US "~~lets~~ lets the down" in the
aggression in Suez 1956.

US threats to India in 1971, India-Pak/Bangladesh
→ from Bomb (Pak perspective)

likewise, Pak Bomb?

[WEB OF CRISIS: One crisis → one
prolif → one more crisis.

[Schell: Underlying respect for nuclear
status, has inherent anti-prolif.

Tolerating prolif ~~is~~ is the (acceptable)
price of maintaining their own
nuclear arsenal.

Hands feel each other in "opposing" camps.
(including money).

Schell's

Schell questions whether the world (i.e. US)
has ever been

Why did CBS go for NPT (without
of the Kufapatine "requirements")

(see JFK + advisors in VN)
CBS not troops + air...

Why hold out NPT? Did it postpone
nuc status in countries we really didn't
want to have nucs?

(Did we care about Sweden, Australia...

Schell: "The H-bomb - the "Super" - puts the
Super in Superpower."

(India, Pak, Japan...)

|| IS OUR CURRENT STRATEGIC POSTURE
|| an appropriate response to prospect of
China or Russian buildup? NO Crazy then,
(after 1965) crazy now + future! (OR: threat of
instability?) ~~does that~~

Schell: USC thinks that a world with nucs
is "safer" (our position is safer) with
(proliferated) nucs than without.

Not, "Beyond the NPT"
(instead of the NPT - for Disarmament plans/statement/NEU
+ then, for NP in next decade

- 1) Can world be made safer than now ^{despite US} with
new testing, new attacks on Iran, new prohib? (Maybe not:
AVOID THESE.
- 2) Can it be made safer than it could otherwise be? YES

Do we want US unilateral Conference on
Abolition? At start?

No — get major industrial countries (US allies)
working on it against US wishes;
adopting a critical attitude on US &
Comm (+ post) intent, posture
NATO...

Isolate US (for its/our own good; just
as I want Congress + Court
+ Media to constrain Exe:
my "treason" to Exe
(loyalty to US Court, country,
troops, citizens...!)

(A "stale" truth from safes, when it
was wrongly withheld from sovereign public).

BREAK the solid NATO front

and NATO / Australia / Japan

and US / Russia!

5-6-05

(Italy! Germans break out!

See my suggestion to ^{in about Dec. 02?} German Ambassador
(to UN?) our strong support, or abstention from
opposition (or initiative! less likely) ~~on~~ demand
of some action is UN that US/UK not use
nukes under any circumstances in Iraq
(i.e. US-CW/BW)

Even if no NWS gives up nukes, nuc-dependent
states (Kujin) can renounce dependence
without leaving NWS! Japan! UK!

5-6-05

Why does State Com keep CW posture?

1) Senior RADM, officer slots, budget

2) MIC money

3) In case Russia or China ever confront US in future US limited conflicts, as in CW, providing "umbrella" vs US FU.
(US FS threat to deter them from intervention, retaliation etc.)

(to CANDOR vs. SLOP = US and Russia
and International Demilitarization)

It is not that US just hasn't thought of what needs to be done to discourage proliferation

or, "hasn't focused on problem"

("caring")

Refusal of true - front is always (?) a hoax: Nixon; now Bush on Iraq; USSR always on disarmament / abolition (since 1948).

Future Magazine:

26 nations that do not now have nukes could have them within 6 months.

(answer to my question)

Verification of withdrawal of toe nukes:

(from Navy ships;
from South Korea
(from Europe? No)

5-6-05

Danp. Kimball: Doesn't believe NK will test — it's a bluff, for bargaining. "Not logical" ^{CIS} — of the test, the loss China [?], combination

Now, if the deal, would US follow. Because of Korea?

[? says: because of 9-11; NK will supply terrorists; and RNEP, etc.

OK — some voices will say that, but...

"Not will China, or Russia or Pak"

("none threatened of NK...")

[? but if US does: say, perhaps test site, to war in less than 18 months...

OK "Wf does from naval arms?"

If US does...

Pak (India) India (China, Pak) China

Wf France? Rebecca Johnson: us. Henny. If don't trust.

Wf UK? "UK won't give up while France keeps them. France + England together could give the up. But for each, there are their own claim to Perm seats + veto on Security Council; they don't want to give them up [to an EC president, or a rolling membership.

(Japan is big total, they can't get a perm. seat without giving up Ant. IX, forswearing war.

And they want to stick close to US: want know

US are umbrella — which the "and" us. China + NK.

My question: Can't "nuc-dependent countries" under
US umbrella remove it?

NATO: Herrnberg

Dutch have raised issue in parliament.

Belgium, too.

Italy, a question. (nucs unpopular)

(UK - no - but debate, along with

France: Blair: Britain's nuc "deterrent"

Italy? (since Iraq, maybe) [of who?]

[Other members of NATO? Spain, etc.

remove EU, umbrella

Germany...

This was in response to

Hans Kristensen article

on "480 nuc ncs" (as of ... 2000?)

BASED ON LEAK!

Johnson? Johnson, no

[If they ever force a real threat, they could
go nuclear quickly.]

Harborschek thinks Putin would be willing to
enter serious disarm. negot.

Reagan

Rebecca Johnson - briefed a NATO NUC planning group
on potential route to abolition - in March? in
Prague - "it's on the agenda" she was told.

She doesn't believe Herrnberg would have
said this today (a story 3 days ago - then denied...) ^{now}
without positive support from other NATO members.
It's controversial in NATO

US in NPT Conf: ultimatum, take-it-or-leave-it -

get the unit get a deal. But no attack on them.

Countries won't confront US, + jeopardize bilateral
relations - Bush will punish dissenters.

Aug 10, 2005

?!

Put NYT on BRK speech
of June '65 on Delphic

NYT July 1, '65 (Searcy)

MCN background on unes
(Porter)

(discussion of unes in VN)

See unes, VN

Holman: SC unes Threats v. China, 1969

(and NRH on deliberation)

{ First Ullman article For. Pol.
{ Know first: French help

French - Israel

(South African: same option

like French, Israel

NRH: MCN convention

of attack on China in '62 (?)

First: MCN on unes & China, Oct '64
(Kaiser?)